DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 613 TM 007 344

AUTHOR Abelow, David; Novak, Carl D.
TITLE A Study of the Practical Implications of the New Title I Reporting and Evaluation System.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 78
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978); Appendex may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Computer Programs; *Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Measurement Goals; *Models; *Program Evaluation; School Districts; Student Testing; Testing Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Nebraska; *RMC Models

ABSTRACT

The RMC Corporation, under contract to the U.S. Office of Education, developed a reporting and evaluation system to be used at the state and local level for evaluating Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I programs. The three evaluation models and RMC's recommendations regarding their implementation specified stringent requirements regarding the use of tests, when tests should be administered, and which norms should be used. Data collected between 1975-1977 on Nebraska Title I projects were examined for their adherence to the specified requirements. Of the 20,519 students providing data in 1975-76 and the 19,190 students providing 1976-77 data, only 3.1% of the Title I students in each year met all four of the specified criteria: (1) tests were given at the empirical norming dates; (2) students were in the program long enough; (3) pre- and post-test reading scores were available; and (4) reading pre- and post-test codes were identical. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) computer program statements, included in the Appendix, were used to perform this analysis. Such data will be useful in identifying aspects of the RMC evaluation models which have been difficult to implement, and therefore require inservice educational programs. (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160613

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Abelow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW TITLE I REPORTING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

David Abelow
Nebraska State Department of Education

Carl D. Novak
Nebraska Educational Service Unit #18

Presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, Toronto

March 31, 1978

TM007 344

Abstract

Nebraska Title I student data for the 1976 and 1977 school years were evaluated to determine the percentage of students who whould meet the evaluation criteria of the new RMC evaluation models. It was found that only 3.1 percent of students in both years met all of the necessary criteria. Recommendations for use of this kind of information by Title I staff in developing inservice programs on the new criteria are given. A listing of the SPSS statements used to generate the statistical report is included.

Introduction

Evaluation of program effectiveness has traditionally been a problem area associated with the administration of ESEA Title I. Both LEAs and SEAs were initially ill-prepared to meet the evaluation requirements established by ESEA in 1965. The situation did not improve substantially between 1965 and 1976. However, progress has been recently made towards improving the technical quality of state and local Title I evaluations. USOE, acting under the provisions of Section 151 of ESEA, has developed a new Title I Reporting and Evaluation System. The system includes three evaluation models to be used at the LEA level and has established regional technical assistance centers to help SEA's and LEA's implement the models and aggregate program impact data.

The three evaluation models and recommendations regarding implementation of the models were developed by RMC Corporation under contract to USOE. Key features of the new models include fairly stringent requirements regarding how tests should be used, when tests should be administered, and which norms should be used.

The information on meeting RMC recommendations would be useful to Title I consultants at the Department of Education, in structuring the inservice programs for local projects. By knowing which of the criteria are not being met, consultants could then emphasize these criteria in inservice sessions. Also, it would be very useful for each local project director to have this breakdown information on their own local projects. Sending this information to local projects was thought to be a very useful and practical way to introduce the new models and the conditions of the models that would have to be met in future years.

Procedures and Results

It was determined that there was not enough lead time to revise the Nebraska Title I forms to make them acceptable to the RMC computer programs. Instead, the already present Title I forms were used and SPSS program statements were developed to simulate the RMC programs. The SPSS program statements are documented in Appendix A.

The variables of interest in this analysis are:

AGRGATR — (1) NO or (2) YES the reading score is aggregatable

GRADE — Grade level, KG through 12, and 99 (other, i.e. drop-outs, etc.).

ENNORMS — (1) NO (2) YES or (0) UNSURE as to whether or not both the pretest and posttest administration dates corresponded to empirical norm dates.

INPROG — (1) NO or (2) YES the students participated in Title I the specified number of weeks (at least 13 weeks for this run).

PPREAD — (1) NO or (2) YES both pretest and posttest reading scores were available.

RTCOMPAR — (1) NO or (2) YES the same test was used as both the pretest and the posttest.

The 1975-76 Nebraska Title I data included data on 258 projects and 20,519 students. The 1976-77 data consisted of 19,190 students in 246 projects.

The results of both the 1976 and 1977 data are presented in the following table:

	1975-76		1976-77	
Criterion	No	Yes	No	Yes
INPROG	7.1%	92.9%	19.4%	80.6%
PPREAD	30.4%	69.6%	36.4%	63.6%
RTCOMPAR	50.1%	49.8%	55.2%	44.8%
ENNORMS	92.2%	7.8%	91.1%	8.9%
AGRGATR	96.9%	3.1%	96.9%	3.1%

In order for a student to have aggregatable data, all four conditions, (1) tests given at the empirical norming dates (2) students in the program long enough (3) presence of both pre- and postreading scores, and (4) reading test codes pre and post are identical, would have to be positive. Only 3.1% of the Title I students in each year met all four of these criteria. The most difficult criteria to meet was ENNORMS. We determined that about 60% of the students took either the pre or the posttest outside the empirical norm period. For about 30% of the students, it was not possible to determine whether the test had been given at a proper time. From the fact that the largest percentage of students are eliminated from being considered aggregatable by the empirical norming dates criteria, we can argue that a great deal of work will have to be done by Title I consultants to acquaint directors with the concepts and reasons for adhering to the empirical norming dates of tests. Work will also have to be done emphasizing tests that have empirical norming dates that fit acceptable pre - post test patterns.

Another criteria that had a majority of "no" responses in both years was RTCOMPAR - reading tests identical. It has been a fairly widespread practice in Nebraska as well as in other states to use different levels of tests if testing occurred in a spring to spring or fall to fall setting since the students would be a year older. The current RMC guidelines suggest that the same test and form be used. Since it is very possible that this RMC recommendation will be contained in the final Title I regulations, it is important that Title I consultants begin to acquaint local project directors with the various possibilities in meeting this guideline.

Summary

In our experience with the two years of Title I data, we have found that the information generated from this data has been useful in several major areas. The information has been very useful in identifying aspects of the RMC models that require intensive inservice programs. State department Title I staff now have some baseline data on the number of students meeting evaluation eligibility requirements and can compare these figures with the data in the next few years. This comparison will certainly be a good indication of the staff's effectiveness in transmitting the logic of the RMC models to local project staff. The individual project summaries have been extremely helpful in introducing the evaluation models to local staff. Local projects will also have baseline data with which to analyze future years of data. We would recommend our procedures to other State Departments of Education as a relatively inexpensive and painless way to generate good baseline data and to generate an effective inservice approach.

APPENDIX A

SPACE ALLOCATION FOR THIS RUN..

TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED 332800 BYTES

DEFAULT TRANSPACE ALLOCATION 41600 BYTES

MAX NO OF TRANSFORMATIONS PERMITTED 416
MAX NO OF RECODE VALUES 1664
MAX NO OF ARITHM.OR LOG.OPERATIONS 3328

RESULTING WORKSPACE ALLOCATION 291200 BYTES

RUN NAME TRIAL SIMULATION OF RMC PROGRAM
VARIABLE LIST PROJECT,GRADE,EXPART,RTESTINO,RTESTIMY,
PREREAD,RTEST2NO,RTEST2MY,POSTREAD
N OF CASES 20519
INPUT MEDIUM DISK
INPUT FORMAT FIXED(2X,F3.0,7X,A2,1X,F1.0,16X,2F2.0,2X,F3.1,2X,2F2.0,2X,F3.1)

ACCORDING TO YOUR INPUT FORMAT, VARIABLES ARE TO BE READ AS FOLLOWS

VARIABLE	FORMAT	RECORD	COLUMNS
PROJECT	F 3. 0	1	3- 5
GRADE	A 2	1	13- 14
EXPART	F 1. 0	1	16- 16
RTESTINO	F 2. 0	1	33- 34
RTESTIMY	F 2. 0	1	35- 36
PREREAD	F 3. 1	1	39- 41
RTEST2NO	F 2. 0	1	44- 45
RTEST2MY	F 2. 0	1	46- 47
POSTREAD	F 3. 1	1	50- 52

THE INPUT FORMAT PROVIDES FOR 9 VARIABLES. 9 WILL BE READ
IT PROVIDES FOR 1 RECORDS ('CARDS') PER CASE. A MAXIMUM OF 52 'COLUMNS' ARE USED ON A RECORD.

```
RECODE          PROJECT TO POSTREAD (BLANK=-999)(0=-999)
COMPUTE         PPREPROG=PREREAD
COMPUTE           PPOSTPOG=POSTREAD
COMPUTE         PR1CODE=RTESTINO
COMPUTE         PR2CODE=RTEST2NO
RECODE            PPPEPOG,PPOSTPOG,PR1CODE,PR2CODE
                (LO THRU 0=1)(1 THRU HI=2)(ELSE=1)
COMPUTE           PPPREAD=PPREPOG + PPOSTPOG
RECODE          PPPREAD (LO THRU 3=1)(4 THRU HI=2)(ELSE=1)
COMPUTE           RTCOMPAR=RTEST2NO-RTESTINO
RECODE          RTCOMPAR (0=2)(-999=99)(ELSE=1)
COMPUTE         INPROG=EXPART
RECODE          INPROG (LOWEST THRU 2=1)(3 THRU HIGHEST=2)
COMPUTE         READGAIN=POSTREAD-PREREAD
COMPUTE         READ=-999
```

```
RECODE          RTEST1NO,RTEST2NO (-999=99)
COMPUTE         RTESTHIT=RTEST1NO + (RTEST2NO / 100)
IF                (RTESTHIT EQ 99.99 OR RTESTHIT EQ 10.10)RTCOMPAR=1
IF                (RTESTHIT EQ 20.20 OR RTESTHIT EQ 30.30)RTCOMPAR=1
IF                (RTESTHIT EQ 40.40 OR RTESTHIT EQ 50.50)RTCOMPAR=1
IF                (RTESTHIT EQ 90.90)RTCOMPAR=1
COMPUTE         AGRGATR=1
COMPUTE          POSTDATE=1
COMPUTE          PREDATE=1
IF               ((RTEST1NO GE 10 AND RTEST1NO LT 16)AND RTEST1MY
                 EQ 3)PREDATE =2
IF               ((RTEST2NO GE 10 AND RTEST2NO LT 16) AND RTEST2MY EQ 3)
                 POSTDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST1NO GE 20 AND RTEST1NO LT 25)AND (RTEST1MY EQ 4
                 OR RTEST1MY EQ 10))PREDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST2NO GE 20 AND RTEST2NO LT 25)AND
                  (RTEST2MY EQ 4 OR RTEST2MY EQ 10))POSTDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST1NO GE 25 AND RTEST1NO LT 30 )AND (RTEST1MY EQ 10
                 OR RTEST1MY EQ 4))PREDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST2NO GE 25 AND RTEST2NO LT 30)AND RTEST2MY EQ 4)
                 POSTDATE=2
IF                ((RTEST1NO GE 30 AND RTEST2NO LT 36)AND(RTEST1MY EQ 10
                 OR RTEST1MY EQ 4)) PREDATE=2
IF                ((RTEST2NO GE 30 AND RTEST2NO LT 36)AND RTEST2MY EQ 4)
                  POSTDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST1NO GE 40 AND RTEST1NO LT 47)AND (RTEST1MY EQ 5
                 OR RTEST1MY EQ 10))PREDATE=2
IF                 ((RTEST2NO GE 40 AND RTEST2NO LT 47)AND(RTEST2MY EQ 5))
                  POSTDATE=2
IF                ((RTEST1NO GE 50 AND RTEST2NO LT 59)AND (RTEST1MY EQ 4
                  OR RTEST1MY EQ 9 OR RTEST1MY EQ 10))PREDATE=2
IF               ((RTEST2NO GE 50 AND RTEST2NO LT 59)AND RTEST2MY EQ 4)
                 POSTDATE=2
IF               (RTEST1NO EQ 80 AND(RTEST1MY EQ 4 OR RTEST1MY EQ 5))
                 PREDATE=2
IF               (RTEST2NO EQ 80 AND(RTEST2MY EQ 4 OR RTEST2MY EQ 5))
                 POSTDATE=2
IF                ((RTEST1NO EQ 75)AND (RTEST1MY EQ 10 OR RTEST1MY EQ 11))
                  PREDATE=2
IF               (RTEST1NO GE 81)PREDATE=0
IF               ((RTEST2NO EQ 75)AND (RTEST2MY EQ 10 OR RTEST2MY EQ 11))
                    POSTDATE=2
IF                (RTEST2NO GE 81)POSTDATE=0
IF               (PREDATE EQ 0 OR POSTDATE EQ 0)ENNORMS=0
IF               (PPEDATE EQ 1 OR POSTDATE EQ 1) ENNORMS=1
IF               (PPEDATE EQ 2 AND POSTDATE EQ 2)ENNORMS=2
IF               ( PPREAD EQ 2 AND INPROG EQ 2 AND
                 ENNORMS EQ 2)AGRGATR=2
VALUE LABELS     PREDATE,POSTDATE,ENNORMS,AGRGATR,PPREAD,INPROG  (0) UNSURE
                (1)  NO  (2)  YES
ASSIGN MISSING  READGAIN (-999),RTCOMPAR (-999),AGRGATR(1)
VAR LABELS           PPREADG PRESENCE OF PRETEST FOR READING/
                     AGRGATR   ARE READING SCORES AGGREGATABLE  /
                     ENNORMS     TESTS GIVEN AT EMPIRICAL NORMING DATES /
```

```
                    PPOSTRDG    PRESENCE OF POSTEST FOR READING/
                   PRICODE PRESENCE OF TEST CODE NO. PRE READING/
                  PR2CODE PRESENCE OF TEST CODE NO.POST READING/
                   PPREAD PRESENCE OF PRE AND POST READING SCORES/
                   RTCOMPAR PRE AND POST READ TEST CODES  IDENTICAL/
                  INPROG STUDENTS IN PROGRAM LONG ENOUGH/
                   PREREAD READING PRETEST IN NCES/
                   POSTREAD   POSTTEST READING SCORE IN NCES/
                   RTEST1NO READING PRETEST CODE NUMBER/
                   RTEST2NO READING POSTEST CODE NUMBER/
                  READGAIN  READING GAIN IN NCES/
                  READ PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I READING/
                  RTESTHIT READ PRE-POST CODE/
MISSING VALUES    PROJECT TO PPREAD,INPROG (=999)
TASK NAME              FINAL PILOT CHECKING QUALIFYING CONDITIONS
SELECT IF         (PROJECT NE -999 AND GRADE NE 99)
PRINT FORMATS     RTESTHIT (2)/GRADE(A)
CROSSTABS         TABLES=GRADE BY AGRGATR,ENNORMS,INPROG,PPREAD,RTCOMPAR
OPTIONS            1,4,5,9

***** GIVEN WORKSPACE ALLOWS FOR  18199 CELLS AND    2 DIMENSIONS FOR CROSSTAB PROBLEM *****

READ INPUT DATA
```